



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

we have already spoken of the wide currency of the idea that like is known by like.

Gronau lays the most stress, however, on parallels between the *De anima et resurrectione* and the myth of Plutarch's *De facie in orbe lunae*. Though he declines to decide between the theories of Heinze and Adler concerning the sources of this myth, in reality he follows Adler in giving Posidonius much that Heinze gives Xenocrates. Gronau thinks that the conception of Gregory that all souls after purification return to God is parallel to Plutarch's thought that the souls are absorbed in the heavenly bodies. On p. 272 he says: "Das Eingehen in den Mond selbst geschieht ohne Beihilfe der Leidenschaften. Die unvernünftige Seele ist vorher im Reinigungsprozesse vom Geiste getrennt. Diese Trennung vollzieht sich durch das Verlangen nach dem Bilde der Sonne, durch das das Anziehende, Schöne . . . hervorglänzt." With this he compares Gregory 93C where it is said that the soul is drawn to God διὰ τῆς ἀγαπητικῆς κινήσεως, but that when it attains its goal, it loses all desire, since this arises only when we do not possess the object of our longing. Now it is clear enough that there is a parallel between the desire of the νοῦς for the sun and of the soul for God. But Gronau is in considerable confusion in regard to the detail of Plutarch's myth. In the first place, he does not carefully distinguish the return of the νοῦς εἰς ἕτερον τόπον, which is presumably the sun, from the absorption of the ψυχή into the moon. The ψυχή, further, is not separated from the νοῦς in the *Reinigungsprozess*, which takes place between the earth and the moon, but on the moon. Then there is no point in contrasting the absorption of the soul into the moon, which takes place without the aid of the affections, with the earlier separation of νοῦς and ψυχή, which is brought about by longing for the sun. For the absorption of the ψυχή into the moon is a symbolic representation of the disappearance of the passionate element, whereas the longing for the sun does not belong to the affective soul, but to the νοῦς. Gregory goes one degree farther than Plutarch. In the process of purification the soul loses all passions except the desire for τὸ καλόν. This process corresponds to the purification in the air and the separation of the νοῦς from the ψυχή in the moon. But when the soul is united to God, Gregory says that it loses every feeling of desire, since desire arises only because of the absence of the longed-for object. This latter thought, to which we have no parallel in Plutarch, is taken ultimately from *Symposium* 200 ff.

GRINNELL COLLEGE

ROGER MILLER JONES

Menander Studien. By SIEGFRIED SUDHAUS. Bonn, 1914. 8vo, pp. 94.

Menandri reliquiae nuper repertae, iterum ed. SIEGFRIED SUDHAUS. Bonn, 1914. Text, critical notes. 12mo, pp. 103.

The *Menander Studien* comprise a series of investigations of the four main plays and of the *Fabula incerta* contained in the Cairo MS. To the

Epitrepontes, including an examination of the "St. Petersburg" fragments, are devoted thirty-three pages and to the *Periceirromene*, together with comments on the "Leipzig" fragments, thirty pages. General discussion and detailed examination of many lines and vexed passages make these studies an indispensable supplement to the second edition itself, in which the critical notes are brief.

The second edition is based in part upon Sudhaus' own collation of the Cairo MS, made subsequently to Jensen's two important collations. It is the most recent report of readings to date and, owing to the author's death¹ constitutes the last of his series of valuable contributions to the text of Menander. He had access also to the Leipzig fragments of the *Periceirromene*, and reports, or implies, many new readings which he supplements freely.

Future editions of Menander must reckon with this work. In it some doubtful lines and passages are settled; many ingenious or suggestive interpretations and supplements are offered; many previously made (including some of his own) are rendered untenable on the basis of Sudhaus' new report. That the Cairo MS was already fading when his collation was made adds perhaps an additional element of uncertainty in deciding here and there between his report and the second collation made previously by Jensen with more time at his disposal.

A typical illustration of this would be the small lacunae in *Epitrep.* 519 (L²=Capps 657). Here Sudhaus² reports C λ ε \ ' ΟΥ C E and supplies ἐ' γ ω' δ', ἐ' γ ω' δ'. ἀλλ' οὐ σ ε etc., but Jensen² reports . . . ! N E (.) . . . ~ OΥ C E, etc. Jensen makes no conjecture, but I would suggest (if the sixth letter can be read as ο), 'ἐκε'ινος 'αὐτός'. This suits sense, space, and letters exactly, except for the apostrophe. Körte's supplement, ἐστὶν ἐπίδηλον, is excluded by Jensen's denial of N or T in the last place. Scores of such contradictions resulting from the two reports might, if space permitted, be discussed.

In the *Epitrepontes* Sudhaus incorporates the St. Petersburg fragments at Act I-II, following Ida Kapp, Hutloff, and others. The including of the *recto*, as well as the *verso*, in this play is due to the insight of Professor Capps, who places the fragments, however, at Act III-IV.

In Act I Sudhaus prefixes to these fragments the hitherto unidentified Cairo fragments Z¹⁻² and makes a nearly consecutive text. He fills out ingeniously, if rather boldly, the large lacunae. The main proof for linking this additional fragment to the *Epitrepontes* rests on his restoration (Z¹,

¹ In a brief prefatory note to the edition Sudhaus states that he had completed only as far as *Periceirromene* 200 (=L² 202) when he went to the war, leaving *die Superrevision* to his friend Ludwig Radermacher. His death was subsequently reported.

This second edition contains, besides the Cairo material, the text, with critical notes, of seven other fragmentary plays. Of these only two, the *Georgos* and the *Colax*, were included in his first edition (1909).

l. 4), of $\Lambda\text{MOI}\Lambda\text{H}$ as $\Pi\alpha\mu\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta$. The traces are not as clear on the facsimile as Sudhaus suggests and the isolated mention of a Pamphila is not final proof.

Sudhaus also adopted Robert's ingenious and much-discussed dovetailing of the fragments M^1+VX^1 and VX^2+M^2 . Nothing conclusive, it may be said, has yet been adduced either for, or against, the combination. Incidentally, however, I may urge in its favor that it would materially shorten the disproportionately long third act. Sudhaus, with proper conservatism, leaves blank the long interstices between the (alleged) opposite verse-ends. Robert's completions of these lines are ingenious samples of Menandrian imitation, but are misleading to the reader and to himself when he actually draws conclusions, including the invention of hypothetical personages, affecting the make-up of the play from the "made ground" filled in by himself!

The fragments β^{1-4} , transferred with certainty from the *Periceiomene* to the *Epitrepontes* by the happy discovery of Oxyrhyncus 1236, he combines with Q^{2-1} at Act IV-V (not numbered by Sudhaus). The fragments U^{1-2} (before the discovery of Oxyr. 1236 combined with Q^{2-1}), he prints simply as an appendix to the play.¹

It may be noted that Sudhaus in all the plays leaves the "Acts" without definite numbering. This enables him to dodge the identification of the end of Act III in *Epitrep.* and also a similar and very perplexing question in the *Samia*. In this latter play the parts preserved indicate pretty clearly that the end of the play is impending in the last lines of the text that remain. We seem to be near the close of Act V. But the text, as preserved, apparently begins early in Act II and the lacuna of ca. 140 verses (which seems to be irrevocably fixed by the argument from the quaternion leaves—see Körte, *Ber. d. Sächs. Gesell.*, 1908, p. 114 and Capps, p. 233) brings us only to Act III for the "Chorus" introduced at line 271 (L^2). No satisfactory solution for this difficulty has yet, so far as I know, been suggested.

Sudhaus in this last edition (apparently from a preconceived interpretation of *Epitrep.* Q^1), still clung stubbornly to his notion that Sophrona is the mother of Pamphila, although Sophrona has long since been accepted (as, e.g., in Terence's usage) as a standing name for a nurse, the rôle, moreover, that best suits the character in the closing scenes of this play.

In the *Periceiomene* Sudhaus has plausibly restored many passages and added to the understanding of the play. In this particular play the temptations are great to fill out the lacunae and to build up the interpretation on the supplements. That some of his supplements are ingenious, without being convincing, would not evoke criticism if the editor (or editors) had been more uniformly careful (as, for example, on the text of the Leipzig fragment)

¹ Had he lived to complete the revision, probably U^{1-2} would have been differently placed. For argument to disprove Robert's combinations of U^{1-2} , Q^{2-1} , β^{1-4} see Allinson, *AJP*, No. 142, pp. 185-202.

to give full data in the critical notes. His deviations from the readings of former editors sometimes seem arbitrary¹ to the reader, who is unable to control his conclusions by a first-hand examination of the text or photograph.

This edition has contributed much to the better understanding of the Menander text and will quicken our approach, necessarily gradual, to a reasonable certainty of what can, and of what cannot, be reconstructed.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

BROWN UNIVERSITY

The Semantic Variability and Semantic Equivalents of -oso- and -lento-.

By EDWARD W. NICHOLS. Yale Dissertation. Lancaster, Pa.: New Era Printing Co., 1914. Pp. 42.

The author begins by stating (p. 1): "The purpose of this dissertation is to show (1) that an adjectival termination in Latin may have a wide range of semantic variability, determined primarily by (a) the stem to which it is attached, (b) the noun which the adjective limits; and secondarily (c) by the more remote context; and (2) that there may be a large number of semantic equivalents for such a termination, determined in each instance by the factors (a), (b), and (c) above." For this exposition he has selected adjectives with the suffixes named in the title.

His own typical example of the method employed may be cited (p. 5): "The word 'ventosus' as used by Tacitus, G., V. 3, means 'exposed to the winds.' The sentence is 'terra umidior qua Gallias, ventosior qua Noricum aspicit.' The wind does not necessarily blow all the time; but when it does the land is swept by it. The meaning 'exposed to' is forced on -oso- by 'ventus' and 'terra.' In Ovid, Fasti, IV. 392, 'primaque ventosis palma petetur equis,' -oso- means 'swift as.' The word 'ventus' connotes several qualities, either (*sic!*) one of which may furnish the tertium quid comparationis between 'ventus' and another noun. Consequently the precise content of -oso- cannot be known until the noun limited is known."

Following the Introduction, chap. i details with examples the various meanings found for the two suffixes: causing, suffering, fraught with, mixed with, living in, growing in, clear as, round as, provided with, subject to, in need of, celebrated in, known to, composed of, fond of or addicted to, under the influence of, prone to, afflicted with, diseased in, as tough as, near, open or exposed to, tossed by, fickle as, swift as, susceptible to or injured by, fit for, clothed in, smelling of, colored like, full of—31 in all. A certain criticism is forestalled (p. 4 *infra*): "No emphasis should be laid on the exact English wording given in the various translations. Translation is merely the imperfect medium through which the fact that the termination has varying semantic content is indicated."

¹ Possibly this may be due in part to the fact that Sudhaus was prevented (see note above) from revising all his notes himself.